



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,565	01/11/2002	Sachin Kukreja	MS#158496.1 (4964)	9442
321	7590	02/09/2006		
SENNIGER POWERS			EXAMINER	
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE			BENGZON, GREG C	
16TH FLOOR				
ST LOUIS, MO 63102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2144	

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/044,565	KUKREJA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Greg Bengzon	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(h).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-45 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. Claims 1,3,5-45 are pending. Claim 4 has been cancelled.

Priority

The effective date of the claims described in this application is January 11, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-23, 35,36-38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-22 are describing an API that is described as 'instructions' and is not embodied in manner that is considered statutory.

Claims 23, 35,36-38 recite limitations citing 'tangible computer readable media' which the Applicant Specifications (page 14) define as a carrier wave or modulate data signals embodied in a carrier wave. The Examiner notes that said carrier wave or data signals embodied in a carrier wave are non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner notes that absent some physical context, a signal per se is an abstract idea in much the same way that a mathematical algorithm without context is an abstract idea.

The word 'tangible' is not sufficient to exclude non-storage computer media, and thus is not considered sufficiently embodying said Claims in statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 24, 35, 36, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carter et al. (US Patent 6742114), hereinafter referred to as Carter.

Carter disclosed Claim 1 - An application programming interface (API) for communication between an administration server and an authentication server connected via a data communication network, said administration server providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network, said authentication server having a database associated therewith storing authentication information for authenticating the users of the namespace service, said administration server being responsive to an administrator for issuing at least one

request to said authentication server, said request specifying at least one action to be performed in relation to the namespace, said API comprising instructions for: receiving, by the authentication server, the request from the administration server; (Column 3 Lines 30-35) verifying, by the authentication server, authority of the administration server to issue the request received by the authentication server; (Column 3 Lines 40-45) and performing, by the authentication server, the action specified by the received, verified request. (Column 4 Lines 15-20)

Carter disclosed Claim 2 - The API of claim 1, wherein the database associated with the authentication server stores authorization information relating to the administration server and wherein verifying the authority of the administration server to issue the request comprises identifying the administration server and locating corresponding authorization information for the administration server in the database associated with the authentication server. (Column 8 Lines 35-40)

Carter disclosed Claim 3 - The API of claim 2, wherein identifying the administration server comprises examining an encrypted ticket accompanying the request, said ticket identifying the administrator. (Column 8 Lines 20-25)

Carter disclosed Claim 4 - The API of claim 2, wherein identifying the administration server comprises examining an encrypted ticket accompanying the request, said ticket identifying the administrator. (Column 8 Lines 20-25)

Carter disclosed Claim 24 - A method for delegating at least one administrative task from a first system to a second system, said first and second systems connected via a data communication network, said second system providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network, said method comprising: maintaining a database of one or more namespaces including the namespace associated with the second system, said database being maintained by the first system; (Column 8 Lines 20-25) receiving a call from the second system by the first system, said call providing a request that at least one routine be performed to implement a desired administrative task for managing the database; (Column 3 Lines 30-35) and executing the routine, by the first system, in response to the call received from the second system to implement the administrative task. (Column 4 Lines 15-20)

Claims 35, 36, and 39 are rejected on the same basis as Claims 1-4, 24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-21, 23-25, 27-41, and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US Publication 2002/0165960) in view of Carter et al. (US Patent 6742114), hereinafter referred to as Carter.

With respect to Claim 1 Chan disclosed an application programming interface (API) for communication between an administration server and an authentication server connected via a data communication network, said administration server providing a service to one or more users on the data communication network, said authentication server having a database associated therewith storing authentication information for authenticating the users service, said administration server being responsive to an administrator for issuing at least one request to said authentication server, said request specifying at least one action to be performed, said API comprising instructions for: receiving, by the authentication server, the request from the administration server; (Chan - Figure 38, Paragraph 223)

However Chan did not disclose said administration server providing a service associated with a namespace. Chan did not disclose verifying, by the authentication

server, authority of the administration server to issue the request received by the authentication server; and performing, by the authentication server, the action specified by the received, verified request.

Carter disclosed deputization of rights across boundaries imposed by namespaces and particular network protocols. A deputy may also delegate rights to additional deputies. Deputization is accomplished using certificates, domain/realm-specific credentials, public and private keys, process creation, and other tools and techniques.

Chan and Carter are analogous art because they present concepts and practices regarding managing access to a related group of resources, such as resources in a domain or namespace. (Chan - Paragraph 23, Carter – Column 9 Lines 45-50) At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Carter regarding deputizing and delegating rights from one namespace into another into the system of Chan. The combination of Chan and Carter would have disclosed an administration server (Chan – Paragraph 101) providing a service associated with a namespace (Carter – Column 5 Lines 5-10, Column 6 Lines 5-10). The combination of Chan and Carter would have disclosed verifying, by the authentication server, authority of the administration server to issue the request received by the authentication server; (Carter - Column 3 Lines 40-45) and performing, by the authentication server, the action specified by the received, verified request.

(Carter - Column 4 Lines 15-20) The motivation for said combination would have been, as Carter suggests (Carter – Lines 5 Lines 1-5) , so that entities responsible for particular actions can be more readily identified.

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 2 - The API of claim 1, wherein the database associated with the authentication server stores authorization information relating to the administration server and wherein verifying the authority of the administration server to issue the request comprises identifying the administration server and locating corresponding authorization information for the administration server in the database associated with the authentication server. (Carter - Column 8 Lines 35-40)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 3 - The API of claim 2, wherein identifying the administration server comprises examining an encrypted ticket accompanying the request, said ticket identifying the administrator. (Carter - Column 8 Lines 20-25)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 4 - The API of claim 2, wherein identifying the administration server comprises examining an encrypted ticket accompanying the request, said ticket identifying the administrator. (Carter - Column 8 Lines 20-25)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 5 - The API of claim 1, wherein performing the specified action comprises reserving the namespace to prevent an unauthorized user from obtaining an account in the namespace. (Chan – Paragraph 129)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 6 - The API of claim 5, wherein reserving the namespace comprises creating an administrator account associated with the administration server to manage the namespace. (Chan – Paragraph 103-104)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 7 - The API of claim 1, wherein performing the specified action comprises releasing the namespace to allow any user to obtain an account in the namespace. (Chan – Paragraph 129)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 8 - The API of claim 1, wherein performing the specified action comprises maintaining and editing a namespace administrator list. (Chan – Paragraph 103-104)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 9 - The API of claim 8, wherein editing a namespace administrator list comprises adding at least one administrator to the namespace administrator list. (Chan – Paragraph 103-104)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 10 - The API of claim 8, wherein editing a namespace administrator list comprises deleting at least one administrator from the namespace administrator list. (Chan – Paragraph 103-104)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 11 - The API of claim 1, wherein performing the specified action comprises editing one or more user accounts in the namespace. (Chan – Paragraph 129)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 12 - The API of claim 11, wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises creating at least one user account in the namespace. (Chan – Paragraph 260-261)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 13 - The API of claim 11, wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises resetting a namespace password associated with at least one of the user accounts. (Chan – Paragraph 260-261)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 14 - The API of claim 11, wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises removing at least one of the user accounts from the namespace. (Chan – Paragraph 260-261)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 15 - The API of claim 11, wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises editing a profile associated with at least one of the user accounts. (Chan – Paragraph 260-261)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 16 - The API of claim 11, wherein editing one or more user accounts in the namespace comprises changing a sign-in name associated with at least one of the user accounts. (Chan – Paragraph 260-261)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 17 - The API of claim 1, wherein performing the specified action comprises: listing user accounts associated with

the namespace; (Chan – Paragraph 134) and evicting one or more of the user accounts from the namespace. (Chan – Paragraph 260-261)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 18 - The API of claim 17, wherein performing the specified action further comprises permitting the respective user to contest an evicted account. (Chan – Paragraph 256)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 19 - The API of claim 1, wherein performing the specified action comprises auditing actions within user accounts associated with the namespace. (Chan – Paragraph 134)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 20 - The API of claim 1, further comprising returning a success response from the authentication server to the administration server if the request was received, the administration server was verified, and the specified action was performed successfully.(Chan – Paragraph 142)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 21 - The API of claim 1, wherein performing the specified action comprises returning an error response from the authentication server to the administration server if the request was received, the administration server was not verified, or the specified action was performed unsuccessfully. (Chan – Paragraph 142)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 23 - The API of claim 1, wherein the instructions are computer-executable instructions stored on one or more computer readable media. (Chan – Paragraph 101)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 24 - A method for delegating at least one administrative task from a first system to a second system, said first and second systems connected via a data communication network, said second system providing a service associated with a namespace to one or more users on the data communication network, said method comprising: maintaining a database of one or more namespaces including the namespace associated with the second system, said database being maintained by the first system; (Carter - Column 8 Lines 20-25) receiving a call from the second system by the first system, said call providing a request that at least one routine be performed to implement a desired administrative task for managing the database; (Carter - Column 3 Lines 30-35) and executing the routine, by the first system, in response to the call received from the second system to implement the administrative task. (Carter - Column 4 Lines 15-20)

The combination of Chan and Carter disclosed Claim 25 - The method of claim 24 wherein the routine comprises an application programming interface (API) for performing the administrative task. (Chan – Paragraph 269-270)

Claim 27-41, and 43-45 are rejected on the same basis as Claims 1-25, as disclosed by the combination of Chan and Carter.

Claims 22,26, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan (US Publication 2002/0165960) in view of Carter et al. (US Patent 6742114), hereinafter referred to as Carter, further in view of Convent et al. (US Publication 2002/0016814) hereinafter referred to as Convent.

While the combination of Chan and Carter substantially disclosed the invention, the said combination did not disclose using an API based on a simple object access protocol (SOAP).

Convent disclosed a method and system for providing an API using the Simple Object Access Protocol. (Paragraph 25)

Chan, Carter and Convent are analogous art because they teach exchanging messages between elements in a distributed computing environment. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Convent into the combined systems of Chan and Carter, in order to allow the API of Chan and Carter to communicate using SOAP. The combination of Chan, Carter and Convent would have disclosed Claim 22, 26, 42 wherein the API is based on a simple object access protocol (SOAP). The motivation for the said combination would have been, as Convent suggests (Convent – Paragraph 8), to enable the API to invoke legacy database stored procedures.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/08/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [*in italics*]:

'...the present invention performs a task or action that manages an authentication database....this limitation is completely absent from the Carter et al. invention. ...claim 1 ...recites...said request specifying at least one action for managing the database to be performed to the namespace....'

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Carter disclosed maintaining authentication information in the DDP or a security database. (Carter – Column 8 Lines 55-57) Thus, each principal that creates a deputy effectively requests a task that requires action on the database. The task of creating a deputy would comprise inserting or updating records in a database and would be considered managing the authentication database.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

Art Unit: 2144

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 20030115201 A1 Krishnamoorthy, Satheesh Kumar - a method of providing entitlement services information to users comprising receiving a request for entitlement services information for a particular user; and in response to receiving the request, accessing a common entitlement services information repository


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greg Bengzon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3944. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571)272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



gcb



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100